

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated December 2, 2009. Claims 1 to 8 and 11 to 14 are pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 11 and 12 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 to 6, 11, 12 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Publication No. 2002/0036790 (Nishiyama) in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0012134 (Calaway) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,418,702 (Tsao) and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0189599 (Ben-Shachar). Claims 7 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Nishiyama in view of Calaway in view of Tsao in view of Ben-Shachar and in further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0077097 (Parry). Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Nishiyama in view of Calaway in view of Tsao in view of Ben-Shachar and in further view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0103885 (Hamada). Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

The present claims concern a system that provides a unique user environment to a plurality of users who share usage of the same information and image processing apparatuses. In such a system, an “active session” for a user is one of a plurality of user sessions that allows a user to exclusively occupy a display unit of the information processing apparatus to operate the information processing apparatus. The information processing apparatus can simultaneously provide, for each of a plurality of users who simultaneously log-on to an operating system of the information processing apparatus, an environment, as an independent user session, in which a program desired by the user can be activated.

According to one aspect of the claims, information regarding an image processing apparatus is received, and the reception of the information is started by one of the user sessions for a predetermined user activating a first display program. The information is sent from the image processing apparatus without waiting for a request from the predetermined user.

According to another aspect, a second display program is activated corresponding to an active session for another user, different from the predetermined user, in order to display the information regarding the image processing apparatus.

By virtue of the foregoing features, it is ordinarily possible to display the information regarding the image processing device, even though the reception of the information was started by a user session for a different user activating the first display program.

Turning to specific claim language, amended independent Claim 1 is directed to a notifying method of notifying a user of information regarding an image processing apparatus which communicates with an information processing apparatus. The information processing apparatus can simultaneously provide, for each of a plurality of users who simultaneously log-on to an operating system of the information processing apparatus, an environment, as an independent user session, in which a program desired by the user can be activated. Print data is transmitted to the image processing apparatus, and the information regarding the image processing apparatus is received. The reception of the information is started by one of the user sessions for a predetermined one of the plurality of users activating a first display program, and the image processing apparatus sends the information without waiting for a request from the predetermined user.

An active session is specified from among the independent user sessions for another of the plurality of users, who simultaneously log-on to the operating system of the information processing apparatus, different from the predetermined user. The other user can exclusively occupy a display unit of the information processing apparatus to operate the information processing apparatus. The active session occupies the display unit of the information processing apparatus in which the plurality of users simultaneously log-on to the operating system. A second display program corresponding to the specified active session is activated in order to display the received information regarding the image processing apparatus on the display unit occupied in the specified active session. If the second display program is activated, the received information is transmitted to the activated second display program. In response to transmitting the received information, the transmitted information is displayed on the display unit of the information processing apparatus occupied in the active session through the second display program.

Claims 11 and 12 are directed to an apparatus and a computer-readable memory medium, respectively, that substantially correspond to the method of Claim 1.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or suggest the features of independent Claims 1, 11 and 12, and in particular, is not seen to disclose or suggest at least the features of (i) receiving information regarding an image processing apparatus, wherein the reception of the information is started by a user session for a predetermined user activating a first display program, and wherein the information is sent without waiting for a request from the predetermined user, and (ii) activating a second display program corresponding to an active session for another user, different from the predetermined user, in order to display the information regarding the image processing apparatus.

Nishiyama is seen to disclose a method for transmitting status data of a printer to a PC. As shown in step S41 of Figure 12, a status data acquisition command is first sent from the PC to the printer. It is then judged whether a display mode for displaying the status data is a manager mode by checking if a user name and password entered at the PC matches a manager name and password for the printer. See paragraph [0067].

The Office Action at page 3 asserts that Nishiyama teaches an obtaining step of obtaining information regarding an image processing apparatus. However, Nishiyama is seen to disclose that a command for acquiring status data of the printer is first sent from the PC to the printer. In other words, the status data of the printer in Nishiyama is not seen to be sent from the printer without waiting for a request from a predetermined user.

Accordingly, Nishiyama is not seen to disclose or suggest (i) receiving information regarding an image processing apparatus, wherein the reception of information is started by a user session for a predetermined user activating a first display program, and wherein the information is sent without waiting for a request from the predetermined user.

The Office Action also asserts at page 3 that Figures 15 to 17 of Nishiyama teach specifying an active session from among user sessions for another of a plurality of users different from a predetermined user. Figures 15 to 17 are seen to disclose status data screens displayed on the display of a PC that sends a command for the acquisition of status data to the printer. The respective users of the PCs of Figures 15 to 17 are seen to be the same users who request the acquisition of status data from the printer. Nishiyama is therefore not seen to disclose or suggest user sessions for different users respectively

starting a reception of information, and activating a display program to display the received information. In other words, Nishiyama is not seen to disclose or suggest that the reception of status data from the printer is started by a user session for a predetermined user, while an active session for another user, different from the predetermined user, corresponds to a display program activated in order to display the status data.

Accordingly, Nishiyama is not seen to disclose or suggest that (ii) in order to display information regarding an image processing apparatus, the reception of which is started by a user session for a predetermined user activating a first display program, a second display program is activated corresponding to an active session for another user, different from the predetermined user.

The Office Action at page 5 asserts that Calaway and Tsao teach having a plurality of users log-on to a single computer/server simultaneously and allowing each user to exclusively occupy a display unit of the computer/server. However, as with Nishiyama, Calaway and Tsao are silent as to user sessions for different users respectively starting a reception of information, and activating a display program to display the received information.

Thus, neither Calaway nor Tsao are seen to disclose or suggest that (ii) in order to display information regarding an image processing apparatus, the reception of which is started by a user session for a predetermined user activating a first display program, a second display program is activated corresponding to an active session for another user, different from the predetermined user.

In addition, neither Calaway nor Tsao is seen to disclose or suggest (i) receiving information regarding an image processing apparatus, wherein the reception of

information is started by a user session for a predetermined user activating a first display program, and wherein the information is sent without waiting for a request from the predetermined user.

Ben-Shachar is seen to disclose an application sharing user interface in which an occluded portion of a shared window is generated from a prior view taken at a time when the occluded portion was not obscured. See Ben-Shachar, paragraph [0006].

However, Ben-Shachar is not seen to disclose or suggest (i) receiving information regarding an image processing apparatus, wherein the reception of information is started by a user session for a predetermined user activating a first display program, and wherein the information is sent without waiting for a request from the predetermined user.

The Office Action at page 5 directs attention to paragraph [0040] in asserting that Ben-Shachar teaches activating a second display program corresponding to an active session specified from among independent user sessions in order to display information regarding an image processing apparatus. The cited portion of Ben-Shachar is merely seen to disclose that content in a shared window may be obscured by other windows, such as notification windows, created in a position that obscures the shared window. There is no mention in Ben-Shachar of such obscuring windows corresponding to a session for another user.

Accordingly, Ben-Shachar is not seen to disclose or suggest that (ii) in order to display information regarding an image processing apparatus, the reception of which is started by a user session for a predetermined user activating a first display program, a second display program is activated corresponding to an active session for another user, different from the predetermined user.

Parry and Hamada have been reviewed, but are not seen to remedy the above-noted deficiencies of Nishiyama, Calaway, Tsao and Ben-Shachar.

Independent Claims 1, 11 and 12 are therefore believed to be allowable over the applied art.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.